arXiv:1409.1105v1 [astro-ph.SR] 3 Sep 2014

Transient Heliosheath Modulation

J J Quenby [1] and W R Webber [2]

[1] *Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College, London, SW7 2BZ, UK.*

[2] *Department of Astronomy, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, USA*

ABSTRACT

Voyager 1 has explored the solar wind-interstellar medium interaction region between the Terminal Shock and Heliopause, following the intensity distribution of galactic cosmic ray protons above 200 MeV energy. Before this component reached the expcted galactic flux level at 121.7 AU from the sun, four episodes of rapid intensity change occured with a behaviour similar to that found in Forbush Decreases in the inner solar system, rather than that expected from a mechanism related to models for the Long Term Modulation found closer to the sun. Because the mean solar wind flow is both expected and observed to be perpendicular to the radial direction close to the Heliopause, an explanation is suggested in terms of transient radial flows related to possible heliopause boundary flapping. It is necessary that the radial flows are at the sound speed found for conditions downstream of the Terminal Shock and that the relevant cosmic ray diffusion perpendicular to the mean field is controlled by 'slab' fluctuations accounting for 20 % or less of the total power in the field variance. However, additional radial drift motion related to possible north to south gradients in the magnetic field may allow the inclusion of some diffusion according to the predictions of a theory based upon the presence of 2-D turbulence The required field gradients may arise due to field variation in the field carried by solar plasma flow deflected away from the solar equatorial plane. Modulation amounting to a total 30 % drop in galactic intensity requires explanation by a combination of transient effects.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the provision of early models of heliosheath modulation (Potgieter and le Roux 1989, Quenby et al. 1990), it has been assumed that this region between the terminal shock and the heliopause is a location where a substantial fraction of the solar modulation of the galactic cosmic ray intensity occurs (see review by Potgieter (2008)). A very recent description of heliosheath modulation in a spherically symmetric approximation is due to Webber

et al. (2013b) while (Potgieter (2013) povides a recent general review. The heliopause represents the boundary beyond which the interstellar cosmic ray intensity would be encountered. Strauss et al. (2013) have recently questioned this assumption and mention various possibilities of increased particle scattering beyond the heliopause as the interstellar field wraps around the Heliopause. Models and observations related to the interaction of the interstellar medium (ISM) with the heliosphere allow a solar wind terminal shock and a heliosheath lying between this shock and the heliopause. These models suggest that the heliosheath comprises a low latitude region where the magnetic structure is determined by reconnection of the sector structure fields and a high latitude region where field lines connect back to the solar wind (Opher el al. 2012). The field is carried by the solar wind as it is diverted to high latitudes and back downwind of the interstellar flow. No interstellar bow shock is expected (McComas et al. 2012) but the external field pressure causes asymmetry in the terminal shock (Opher et al. 2006) and may also explain intermitent observation of shock accelerated cosmic rays (Jokipii et al. 2004, Stone et al. 2005) prior to the termination shock crossing. The dramatic Voyager 1 observation of two sudden increases of the greater than 200 MeV proton galactic cosmic ray (GCR) component near the heliopause reached at 121.7 AU (Webber and McDonald, 2013a, Stone et al., 2013) presents a challenge to current ideas of modulation within the heliosheath. It is the purpose of this paper to provide a simple class of models for these sudden increases in terms analagous to the cause of Forbush Decreases in the inner solar system. There should exist transient, enhanced radial plasma flows which may or not be accompanied by changes in magnetic field gradients suitable to yield enhaced particle drift speeds. A companion paper (Webber and Quenby, 2014) discusses the observations of the two extra-ordinary increases in GCR intensity in relation to magnetic field data and the force field modulation model.

2. VOYAGER DATA

The starting point of this work lies in data obtained by Webber and McDonald (2013a) from the Voyager 1 CRS instrument (Stone et al. 1977). We concentrate on the period of the final increase in the $>$ 200 MeV proton intensity to attain the expected galactic flux value, witnessed by the steady intensity distribution beyond 121.7 AU. The increase around 2012 day 240 is represented by a change of scaled count rate from 4.08 to 4.58 in 3.7 days (see figure 1, Webber and McDonald, 2013a). In figure 2 of Webber and Quenby (2014) it is seen that these data correspond to the final, step like GCR intensity increase before a galactic value is reached and that it is preceeded by two fluctuations of similar magnitude over the previous month. These two preceeding flutuations do not reach the galactic GCR

value. They could be regarded as two Forbush Decreases exhibiting rapid recovery of the flux to pre-decrease levels or above. If this structure in the GCR intensity is convected past Voyager 1 with velocity V_{100} in units of 100 km/sec, the spatial gradient is typically $0.56/V_{100}$ per AU. Since the spacecraft is moving at only 0.07 AU per week, it is very unlikely that the intensity structure is stationary in time. The regions of observed high spatial gradient extend back to about 120.5 AU to include the second region of high spatial gradient discussed by Webber and Quenby (2014). A significant observation by these last authors lies in the relative modulation of the 200 MeV protons and of 10 MeV galactic electrons. Both species exhibit the step intensity increases but the relative modulation is higher by about a factor two for the electron channel

In order to estimate the likely mean solar wind velocity close to the heliopause, we appeal to the models provided by Opher et al.(2012) who provide alternatives, based upon whether or not reconnection in the sector region is included. Some verification is provided by using the Low Energy Charged Particle (LECP) Voyager 1 results to deduce the radial and tangential flow components in the absence of a working plasma probe. Unfortunately the numerical results need scaling from a modelled heliopause at 162 AU. The Opher et al. (2012) flow vectors are given, both at 120 AU which is within 2 AU of the heliopause and at 110 AU for the radial, tangential and normal components in Table 1 for alternative models, either ignoring the low-latitude sector structure or taking into account reconnection associated with the sector structure.

The LECP keV data is given at 110 AU for two components. It appears that the experiment seems to agree better with the sector model for V_R and the non-sector model for V_T. However, the data exhibits very large fluctuations throughout the heliosheath. Negligible LEPC data is available for the normal, V_N component which clearly becomes the dominant steady flow at these distances. We estimate the measured $V_N(110)$ as the

Table 1: Opher et al. (2012) Models and Voyager 1 Flow data in the Heliosheath in km/sec

Source	$V_R(120)$	$V_T(120)$	$V_N(120)$
No-Sector	44	-30	68
Sector	4	-5	30
Data			
	$V_R(110)$	$V_T(110)$	$V_N(110)$
No-Sector	52	-71	50
Sector	12	- 5	15
Data	22	-36	(29)

mean ot the other two components. Extrapolation of the experimental results suggests that $V_R(120), V_T(120) \leq \pm 20$ km/sec.
Magnetometer data obtained by Burlaga et al. (2013) during the heliopause crossing enable us to estimate the power in the fluctuations of the magnitude of **B**. These authors observe a period of outward pointing polarity in 2012 from DOY 150 to DOY 171, inward polarity from DOY 176 to DOY 202 and outward polarity from DOY 204 DOY 238, the last period including two intervals where post-heliopause conditions are apparently encountered. Using data from figure 2 of Burlaga et al. (2013), we give in Table 2 the mean and standard deviations of the fields in these 3 periods, neglecting the post-heliopause data. The quoted experimental errors are ± 0.01 nT, so are not expected to greatly distort the estimates of the standard deviation.

An estimate of the correlation length of the field magnitude fluctuations may be obtained from the power spectrum provided by Burlaga and Ness (2010) where a break at 1.8×10^{-7} Hz is found in the Voyager 1 data at 110 AU. If the field is convected past the spacecraft at a relative speed of 46 km/sec, as suggested by the data, the correlation length is 1.7 AU, taking into account the Voyager 1 velocity
Webber and Quenby (2014) show large changes in the magnetic field energy density well correlated with the large fluctuations in GCR intensity during the period day 208 to day 240. This observation provides indirect evidence of significant change in plasma velocity. Quenby and Webber (2013) have suggested that transient radial plasma flow velocities near the boundary, triggered by large changes in plasma pressure, could reach the sound speed obtained by Borovikov et al. (2011) in simulations of post terminal shock conditions. Their value is 228 km/sec. The attainment of this speed out to near the heliopause depends on the plasma temperature not decaying significantly. If the Alfven speed becomes the dominant fast mode speed, a simple estimate can be made based on the continuity of mass flow, $nVr^2 =$ constant where n is plasma number density at radial distance r. Using the observed field and the post-shock and non-sector velocities of previously mentioned models, we find an Alfven speed of 31 km/sec at 120 AU.

Table 2: Voyager 1 Field Magnitude and Standard Deviation, sd

Period	DOY 150-171	DOY 176-202	DOY 204-238
B, nT	0.182	0.339	0.225
sd, nT	0.0690	0.0596	0.0735

3. DIFFUSION MEAN FREE PATHS

To carry out our calculation, we need to estimate possible values of the diffusion coefficients parallel and perpendicular to the mean field. We will use a theoretical formulation which has achieved reasonable agreement with experimental results in the inner Heliosphere, but employing field data obtained far out in the Heliosheath. The waves in the field model are composed 80% of a 2-dimensional component with fluctuation vectors perpendicular to both the mean field and wave propagation direction and 20% of a slab component with fluctuations perpendicular to the mean field but with wave propagation along the mean field. As derived by Le Roux et al. (1999), this composite field model yields a parallel diffusion mean free path

$$\lambda_{||} = 2.433 \frac{B^2}{b_{x,sl}^2} (\frac{P}{cB})^{1/3} \lambda_{sl}^{2/3} \times F \tag{1}$$

where P is particle rigidity, B is the mean field, $b_{x,sl}$ is the x component of the slab field fluctuations, λ_{sl} is the correlation length of the fluctuations, which are assumed to be valid for all components and F is function very close to unity in the present application. Pei et al. (2010) employ a very similar result to model the parallel diffusion coefficient throughout the Heliosphere.

For the perpendicular diffusion coefficient, we follow the Le Roux et al. (1999) non-perturbative approach where

$$D_{sl} = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{sl} A_{sl}^2; \quad D_{2D} = \lambda_{2D} A_{2D} \tag{2}$$

D_{sl} describes the magnetic field wandering due to slab turbulence with $A = b_{x,sl}/B$ with a corresponding correlation length λ_{sl}. D_{2D} denotes the magnetic field line wandering for 2-D fluctuations. A_{2D} is the amplitude for this turbulence and λ_{2D} is the corresponding correlation length perpendicular to background field.

We note that if the contribution of the 2-D fluctuations is ignored, the perendicular diffusion coefficient becomes the expression given in Jokipii (1971)

$$K_{\perp} = \frac{v}{4} \frac{P_{xx}(0)}{B^2} \tag{3}$$

where $P_{xx}(0)$ is the power in one slab component at zero frequency. If however, 2D turbulence dominates, we find from le Roux et al. (1999) the modified value

$$K_{\perp,2D} = \frac{1}{2} v \lambda_{2D} A_{2D} \tag{4}$$

Le Roux et al. (1999) also consider the quasi-linear model of Chuvilgin and Ptuskin (1993) whih also takes into account resonant and nonresonant interactions. These last authors derive

$$K_{\perp} = 0.5 A^2 K_{||} \tag{5}$$

where A is the total fractional deviation in the field. We neglect a relatively unimportant adjustment to the numerical value given in this last equation to obtain agreement with some numerical simulations performed at 1 AU.

In the following section it will become apparent that the simple, Jokipii, (1971) expression is more likely to satisfy the proposed modulation model. In Table 3, values of parallel diffusion coefficients and mean free paths are calculated from the data of Table 2, using the Le Roux et al. (1999) expression, equation (1), while perpendicular diffusion coefficients and mean free paths are obtained from the same data using the Jokipii (1971) expression. To estimate the power in the slab component, ie that due to wave propagation along the mean field direction, it is assumed that the dominant fluctuation power is transverse. To first order,

$$\frac{sd}{B} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\delta B_{\perp}^2}{B^2} \tag{6}$$

and if only 20% of the standard deviation results from the slab-like fluctuations, then

$$P_{xx}(0) = 0.2\frac{\lambda_{sl}}{2\pi}\frac{\delta B_{\perp}^2}{2} \tag{7}$$

It is assumed that $\lambda_{sl} = 1.7$ AU. Note that Pei et al (2010) find values of $\lambda_{\perp} \sim 10^{-2}$ AU for 100 MeV protons far out in the heliosphere based on models for the development of turbulence.

Using the 2D turbulence model as expressed by Le Roux et al. (1999), we obtain $K_{\perp,2D} = 4.5 \times 10^{-4}$ AU^2/s or $\lambda_{\perp,2D} = 1.2$ AU for the period DOY 176-202 of Table 3. The Chuvilgin and Ptuskin (1993) expression yields $K_{\perp,2D} = 1.2 \times 10^{-3}$ AU^2/s or $\lambda_{\perp,2D} = 3.0$ AU

4. A TRANSIENT 3-D MODULATION APPROXIMATION

In the first model of the approximation of this section the aim is to attempt to explain the observed large radial gradients near the heliopause in terms of transient radial velocities and

Table 3: Parallel and Perpendicular Diffusion Coefficients and Mean Free Paths derived from Table 2 Data for 200 MeV protons

Period	DOY 150-171	DOY 176-202	DOY 204-238
$K_{\|\|}AU^2s^{-1}$	7.42×10^{-3}	1.3×10^{-2}	8.01×10^{-3}
$\lambda_{\|\|}$ AU	19.6	34.3	21.2
$K_{\perp}AU^2s^{-1}$	2.9×10^{-6}	1.35×10^{-6}	2.52×10^{-6}
$\lambda_{\perp}AU$	7.68×10^{-3}	3.57×10^{-3}	$6,64 \times 10^{-3}$

diffusion parameters which seem to be possible according to the limited plasma information available. The argument could be reversed to make use of the cosmic ray data to suggest nesessary values for the plasma parameters. No attempt will be made to provide a 3-D modulation solution encompassing a large Heliospherical volume. Instead, a Cartesisn geometry is adopted to describe a limited region close to the heliopause, rather than spherical polar coordinates which are better as a basis for overall Heliospheric modulation modelling. A quasi-steady state will be assumed, as has been applied previously to the modelling of short-term changes in the inner Heliosphere where field structure, convected past the observer, carries a particle distribution which only changes slowly in time. (eg Mulligan et al. 2009 and Quenby et al. 2008) Setting $\mathbf{x}$ in the radial direction $\mathbf{y}$ in the azimuthal direction and $\mathbf{z}$ to complete the right handed set, the Fokker-Planck equation in the Sun's reference frame for the differential number density $U(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is (eg Quenby (1984),

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + \nabla \mathbf{S} + \frac{\partial}{\partial T}(\frac{dT}{dt})U = 0 \tag{8}$$

where the streaming is

$$\mathbf{S} = C\mathbf{V}U - \underline{K}.\nabla U \tag{9}$$

and the Sun frame kinetic energy, T, loss rate is

$$\frac{dT}{dt} = \mathbf{V}.\nabla(\frac{\alpha T U}{3}) \tag{10}$$

where $\alpha = (T + 2m_\circ)/(T + m_\circ)$. $m_\circ$ is rest mass and the Compton Getting factor C is

$$C = (1 - \frac{1}{3U}\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\alpha T U) \tag{11}$$

The slope of the energy spectrum and α are assumed to be constant over the limited region of application of the above Fokker Planck equation, thus both C and the pressure term in the expression for kinetic energy T are independent of position. The spectral slope at 200 MeV is obtained from Stone et al. (2013). Resolving components, we notice that perpendicular diffusion applies in the $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ directions while parallel diffusion applies in the $\mathbf{y}$ direction. We also allow the transverse diffusion coefficient to yield a drift velocity $V_{d,z}$ in the direction perpendicular to the plane of the spacecrafts orbit due to the large scale Parker field structure and a possible drift $V_{d,x}$ due to a field gradient in the $\mathbf{z}$ direction arising from lack of symmetry about the equatorial plane. The steady state Fokker-Planck becomes

$$\begin{aligned} K_\perp \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial x^2} - (1.15V_x + V_{d,x})\frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + K_{||}\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial y^2} - 1.15V_y\frac{\partial U}{\partial y} \\ + K_\perp \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial z^2} - (1.15V_z + V_{d,z})\frac{\partial U}{\partial z} = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Neglecting spatial variation in $\mathbf{V}$ and $\underline{K}$ and specifying $U_\circ$ as the differential number density at the origin of coordinates, that is at the bottom of the region of sudden intensity increase, a seperable, trial solution results in

$$U = U_\circ exp(\frac{(1.15V_x + V_{d,x})x}{K_\perp} + \frac{1.15V_y y}{K_{||}} + \frac{(1.15V_z + V_{d,z})z}{K_\perp}) \tag{13}$$

Hence the solution tracks the initial, outward rise in intensity. $U_\circ$ is determined by the boundary conditions on the heliopause and the relative ease of entry of GCR along the three spatial directions. However this work is not attempting a complete 3D solution, especially as the plasma parameters along the three directions are poorly known. Rather we point out the expected result that a local radial, $\mathbf{x}$, directed gradient requires a matching radial, outward directed plasma flow. In the absence of a suitable drift velocity, such a flow does not exist, close to the heliopause in the time independent Heliosphere model of Opher et al. (2012) Therefor, radial gradients close to this boundary may require transient radial flows. We first explore a 'drift free' model. To obtain modulation below the GCR level near the heliopause, sudden bursts of radial plasma velocity need to appear sufficiently frequently so there is always one event within about 1 AU of the boundary if the series of steep depressions shown in Figure 1 of Webber and McDonald, (2013a) are to be explained. It is within this region that the intensity switches from near the GCR level to a modulated level. Any lesser occurence frequency would mean a further encroachment of the GCR level within the heliosheath.

As source of the transient radial plasma flows, we postulate that the radial plasma flow corresponds to the flows required by Quenby and Webber (2013) who suggested that the heliopause flapped with the speed of the fast mode, here identified as the sound speed in the hot solar wind plasma. The flapping could be caused by pressure imbalance with the external medium as the solar wind plasma pressure varies.

In order to see if the diffusion and flow parameters discussed in sections 2 and 3 can satisfy the observed gradient employing the transient modulation model, we find the radial cosmic ray gradient from the adopted solution as given by

$$K_\perp \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} = 1.15V_x + V_{d,x} \tag{14}$$

On DOY 240, 2012, $\frac{\partial U}{\partial t_s} = 0.032$ per day is the rate of intensity change in the reference frame of V1. In the adopted model DOY 240 is regarded as corresponding to the end of a field structure convected past V1 as the heliopause expands. The gradient then refers to the entry of particles into the region of reduced intensity by diffusion in competition with the wind outward sweeping. Since the measurement of the actual spatial gradient is determined by the adopted radial wind speed, the above equation can be written as

$$K_\perp = 1.39 \times 10^{-6} V_{x,100}^2 + 1.19 \times 10^{-6} V_{d,x,100}.V_{x,100} \quad \mathrm{AU^2 s^{-1}} \tag{15}$$

where $V_{x,100}$ and $V_{d,x,100}$ are respectively the radial and drift velocities in units of 100 km/sec. Neglecting the addition drift term in $V_{100,d,x}$ on the right hand side of the above equation, if the radial flow is $\sim$ 100 km/sec, the estimated values of $K_\perp$ found in Table 3 seem to satisfy the measured gradient. Suitable flow values are the sound speed estimated from post terminal shock conditions or the Opher et al (2012) model which ignores the sector structure. However, this second, model estimate does not provide transient effects. Models for $K_\perp$ which add 2-D turbulence onto the slab turbulence field line wandering so as to yield the dominant effect are less likely to satisfy the cosmic ray data.

The average drift motion at the epoch of observation is northward for positive charged particles in the northern solar hemisphere because the average solar field is inward at the time The drift magnitde V_d from guiding centre theory is

$$V_d = \frac{1}{\omega R}\frac{2}{3}v^2 = \frac{2vPc}{3BR} \tag{16}$$

where ω is the cyclotron frequency, P the rigidity and R estimates both the field line radius of curvature and the fractional field gradient. Using the mean measured field at 120 AU and assuming R=120 AU, the northward drift speed $V_{d,z} = 54$ km/sec. However, transient changes show both a field line polarity switch and a field magnitude gradient which is positive in the outward direction (Burlaga et al., 2013), thus reinforcing the northward proton drift. Hence modulation can be enhanced in the northward direction, as compared with the solar wind sweeping.

For charge e, the field gradient and curvature drift are aligned in the $\frac{1}{e}\mathbf{Bx}\nabla\mathbf{B}$ direction. Hence for protons, an episode of outward directed north hemisphere $\mathbf{B}$ together with a limited region of $\nabla\mathbf{B}$ directed in the $-\mathbf{z}$ direction produces an outward, $\mathbf{x}$ directed drift. According to the Opher et al. (2012) model with the sector structure included, gradients $(\nabla B)/B \approx 0.018$/AU may exist in the southward or $-\mathbf{z}$ direction on the edge of the sector region. This would lead to a radial drift of 115 km/sec, outward for outward north hemisphere field epochs. Neglecting for the moment the evidence provided by the electron modulation, one may develop the idea of a drift dominated flow. Burlaga et al. (2013) observed an unexpected field increase close to the heliopause. Averaging over a time period equivalent to a distance scale of 6 cyclotron radii for a 200 MeV proton, a field gradient $(\delta B)/B \approx 0.78$/AU is obtained. If this also occured in the $-\mathbf{z}$ direction, perhaps as a transient effect, a radial drift of 4900 km/sec would be possible. The effect of adding these various values of outward radial drifts on the required value of $K_\perp$ can be seen by employing equation (15). As before, it is assumed that the end of the passage of a field structure on DOY 240 is being considered. Additionaly a typical plasma motion $\sim$100 km/s is used in order to estimate the spatial gradient. We find $K_\perp = 6.3 \times 10^{-5}$ AU^{2}s^{-1} is allowed if the field gradient is 0.78/AU directed southward. However, from the equation for the drift speed, it is found that electrons of 10 MV rigidity drift two orders of magnitude slower than 200 MeV protons

and are therefore relatively insensitive to field gradient effects. Since the electron modulation is greater than that of protons, it is very unlikely that drift can dominate the modulation near the heliopause. This is because the electron scattering mean free path at 10 MV is unlikely to show a large reduction compared with that of a 200 MeV proton. In any case, there still seems to be shortfall by a factor near 10 as compared with the estimated 2D turbulence model for perpendicular diffusion. It is perhaps significant that two periods of large radial gradient seen by Webber and McDonald (2013a) centred on DOY 128 and 209 are in periods of outward pointing field.

Turning to the GCR sudden increase starting on day 128, the lack of detailed correlation with change in magnetic field amplitude led Webber and Quenby (2014) to suggest the cause lies in structure $\sim$ 1 AU in extent. On the basis of the model provided here, the necessary sudden, radial increase in solar wing plasma velocity, together perhaps with an outward, radial particle drift speed, must have occured between V1 and the heliopause and not at the location of V1. In fact, since the major plasma flow is expected to be northwards out of the ecliptic plane this close to the heliopause, there is no necessity for V1 to see the plasma changes responsible for the sudden increase being convected past the spacecraft prior to the event. For our model to explain the day 128 increase, we have two requirements. The first is that the northward plasma flow brings a large plasma pressure increase causing rapid outward expansion at the heliopause with or without a suitable $-\mathbf{z}$ directed field gradient to allow enough outward GCR motion to counter inward diffusion. The second requirement is that the scale size of the changes to the plasma parameters close or at the heliopause provide a depletion region of GCR intensity where particle leakage from the $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$ directions is slower than the current due to the outward convection or drift velocities. If our model is reasonable, the ocurrence of the day 128 increase is both evidence for dramatic movement at or within 1 AU of the heliopause and of a scale size of the movement in directions parallel to the heliopause of several AU.

5. MEAN FREE PATH RIGIDITY DEPENDENCE

Webber and Quenby (2014) discuss the rigidity dependence of the modulation during the period of the two increases, days 128 to 238. A problem arising from the data analysis reported by these authors which the work presented here has not explained is the lack of apparent charge splitting in the relative modulation suffered by protons and alpha particles. This splitting was first predicted by the force field approximation of Gleeson and Axford (1968). However, unlike the previous authors, we do not depend either on assuming no net streaming in a particular direction or on integrating the solution between the spacecraft and the boundary of modulation. Instead, we simply consider the local values of the intensity

gradients during the increases. This however limits the discussion to the relative changes in electron and proton intensity, these being the species for which we have detailed information. From equation (13), the ratio electron to proton gradients in the x direction if $V_x >> V_{d,x}$ is

$$\frac{1}{U_\circ(P_e)}\frac{\partial U(P_e)}{\partial x}/\frac{1}{U_\circ(P_p)}\frac{\partial U(P_p)}{\partial x} = \frac{K_{\perp,p}(P_p)}{K_{\perp,e(P_e)}} = \frac{\beta_p\lambda_{\perp,p}(P_p)}{\beta_e\lambda_{\perp,e}(P_e)} \tag{17}$$

where P_e, P_p and β_e, β_p are the magnetic rigidities and velocities of the electron and protons observed. From Fig 2 Webber and Quenby, (2014), the ratio of the fractional electron to proton intensity change measured at the step change around day 210, 2012 is 2.6. Taking the electron mean energy as 10 MeV and the protons as corresponding to 200 MeV, a mean free path dependence $\lambda_\perp \propto P^{0.4}$ is required to fit the diffusion of both species if the day 210 change represents the ratio of electron to proton intensity gradients. For the day 128 step, the gradient ratio is 1.6 and the exponent of the rigidity dependence is 0.29. . This fit favours the rigidity dependence of equation (5) if equation (1) is used to define $K_{||}$. However, the absolute value of the perpendicular diffusion coefficient is still more than two orders of magnitude too large to balance the expected transient convective radial flow.
A drift dominated model seems excluded by the relative size of the electron to proton step changes and therefore cannot be used to discuss the mean free path rigidity dependence. As a conclusion to this section (5) it seems that none of the expressions for the perpendicular diffusion coefficient discussed simultaneously satisfy both the absolute magnitude and rigidity depndence implied on either of the two transient modulation models suggested. A small addition to the Jokipii (1971), equation (3) expression, dependent on a $\lambda_{||} \propto P^{1/3}$ due to nonresonant interactions would seem to provide the closest overall fit.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In the attempt to explain the unexpectedly large radial cosmic ray gradients observed around 120 AU an appeal has been made to the possible existence of transient outward plasma flows, approaching the sound speed in the Heliosheath. Interpreting the available magnetometer data to yield a suitable value of the perpendicular diffusion coefficient, it was necessary to employ a model of scattering dependent only on 20% of the measured fluctuation power. This power would constitute the percentage present in waves propagating along the magnetic field direction. The resulting modulation model is similar to that expected from a succession of Forbush Decreases in the inner Heliosphere. Field gradient particle drift effects can also play a role in modulation near the heliopasuse. If these are sufficiently large, additional diffusion based upon 2-D turbulant fields may explain the rigidity dependence of the modulation. Transient changes in radial plasma speed or field gradient necessary to

cause the observed sudden GCR intensity changes do not necessarilly need to be located at the spacecraft but may alternatively occur between the spacecraft and the heliopause. However, although we believe it worthwhile discussing the two transient modulation models we provide, problems arise in satisfying the observed rigidity dependence of the modulation in terms of available models and data relating to diffusion in the Heliosheath. Further information on the relevent plasma parameters, especially transient effects, at 120 AU is required to determine whether either of the proposed models will remain successful. Also further ellucidation of the relation of magnetic field turbulence to the actual cosmic ray diffusion perpendicular to the mean field seems required.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

W R Webber thanks his Voyager 1 colleagues from the CRS instrument, especially the late Frank McDonald and Project PI Ed Stone. Magnetometer data were obtained by Len Burlaga and Norman Ness.

8. REFERENCES

Borovikov S. N., Pogorelov N. V., Burlaga L. F., Richardson J. D., 2011, ApJ, 728 L21

Burlaga L. F., Ness N. F., Acuna M. H., Richardson J. D., Stone E. C., McDonald F. B.,2009 ApJ, 692, 1135

Burlaga l. F., Ness N. F., 2010, ApJ., 725, 1306

Burlaga L. F., Ness N. F., 2012, ApJ., 749, 13

Burlaga L. F., Ness N. F., Stone E. C., 2013, Science, 341, 150

Chuvilgin L, G., Ptuskin V. S., 1993, Astron. Astrophys., 279, 273

Gleeson L.I., Axford W.I., 1968, Ap.J., 154, 1011

Gurnett D. A., Kurth W. S., Cairns I. H., Mitchell J., 2006 in Heerikhuisen J.,Florinski V., Zank G. P., Pogorelov N. V., eds, Physics of the Inner Heliosheath. American Inst. Phys. p.129

Jokipii J.R., 1971, Rev. Geophys. Space Sci, 9, 27

Jokipii J. R., Giacaloni J., Kota J., 2004 ApJ 611, L141

Krimigis S. M., Roelof E. C., Decker R. B., Hill M. E.,
2011, Nature 474, 359
Krimigis S. M., Decker R. B., Roelof E. C.
Hill M. E., Armstrong T. P.,Gloeckler G.,
Hamilton D. C., Lanzerotti, L. J., 2013
Science, 341, 144
Le Roux J. A., Zank G. P., Ptuskin V. S., 1999,
J. Geophys. Res., 104, 24845
McComas D.J., Alexashov D. A., Browski M., Fahr H.,
Heerikhuisen J.,Izmodenov V., Lee M.A., Mobius
Mulligan T., Blake, J. D., Shaul D., Quenby J. J.,
Leske R. A., Mewaldt D. M., Galametz M., 2009,
J Geophys. Res. Space Phys., 114, 13783
M. A., Pogorelov N., Schwadron N.A., Zank G.P., 2012
Science, 336, 1291
Nkosi,G. S., Potgieter M. S., Webber W. R., 2011,
Adv.in Space Res., 48, 1480
Opher M., Stone E. C., Liewer P.C., 2006 ApJ. 640 L71
Opher, M., Drake J. F., Velli M., Decker R.B., Tooth G.,
2012, ApJ, 751, 80
Pei C., Bieber J. W., Breech B., Burger R. A.,
Clem J., Matthaeus W. H., 2010,
J. Geophys. Res.,115,A03103
Potgieter M. S., Le Roux J. A., 1989, A & A, 209, 406
Potgieter, M. S., 2008, Advances in Space Sci. 41, 245
Potgieter, M. S., 2013, Living Reviews in
Solar Physics DOI:10.12942/lrsp-2013-3
Quenby J. J., 1984, Space Sciences Review, 37, 201
Quenby J. J., Lockwood J. A., Webber W. R., 1990,
ApJ, 365, 365
Quenby J. J., Mulligan T., Blake J. B.,
Mazur J. G., Shaul D., 2008, J Geophys. Res.,
Space Phys., 113, 12849
Quenby J. J., Webber W. R., 2013, Monthly Notices
Royal Astronomical Society, 436, 3306
Scherer K., Fichtner H., Strauss R.D.,
Ferreira S. E., Busning L., Potgieter M.S.,
2008, Ap J., 680, L105

Stone E. C., Vogt R. E., McDonald F. B., Teegarden B. J., Trainor J. F., Jokippi, J. R., Webber W. R., 1977, Space Science Reviews, 21, 355

Stone E, C., Cummings A. C., McDonald F. B., Heikkila B., Lal N., Webber W. R., 2013, Science, 341, 150

Strauss R.D., Potgieter M.S., Ferreira S. E. S., Fichtner H., Scherer K., 2013, ApJ. Lett. 76 L18

Webber W.R., McDonald F.B., 2013a, Geophys.Res.Lett., 40, 1665

Webber W.R., Higbie P. R., McDonald F.B., 2013b, arxiv..org ;1308.1895

Webber W.R., Quenby J J.,2014 Submitted for publication